

17645. Misbranding of Mentho-Squillo. U. S. v. 50 Bottles of Mentho-Squillo. Default decree of condemnation and destruction entered. (F. & D. No. 24783. I. S. No. 037564. S. No. 3148.)

An examination of a drug product known as Mentho-Squillo, having shown that the labels bore certain claims of curative and therapeutic effects that the article was unable to accomplish, the Secretary of Agriculture reported to the United States attorney for the Southern District of Texas the following interstate shipment involving a quantity of the product.

On May 26, 1930, the said United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 50 bottles of Mentho-Squillo, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Houston, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Mansfield Drug Co., from Baton Rouge, La., March 6, 1930, and had been transported from the State of Louisiana into the State of Texas, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of acetic acid, menthol, ethyl nitrite (0.05 grain per fluid ounce), alcohol (6.9 per cent), sugar, and water.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements borne on the bottle and carton labels were false and fraudulent: (Bottle label) "Syrup Mentho-Squillo * * * as needed in coughs;" (carton) "The famous cough remedy * * * coughs, Sore Throat, Croup, Tonsillitis."

On June 28, 1930, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17646. Misbranding of S-T-S Little Wonder suppositories. U. S. v. 8 Dozen Packages of S-T-S Little Wonder Suppositories. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 24946. I. S. No. 374. S. No. 3305.)

Examination of samples of a drug product known as S-T-S Little Wonder suppositories, from the herein described interstate shipment having shown that the labels bore claims of curative properties that the article did not possess, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the District of Colorado.

On August 7, 1930, the said United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 8 dozen packages of S-T-S-Little Wonder suppositories, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by the Esbencott Laboratories, East Portland, Oreg., alleging that the article had been shipped from Portland, Oreg., on or about May 13, 1930, and had been transported from the State of Oregon into the State of Colorado, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of theobroma oil as a base, boric acid, tannin, zinc phenolsulphonate, and a trace of methyl salicylate.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements appearing on the box label, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said article, were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed: "Treatment for Leucorrhoea (Whites) and Vaginal Infections."

On September 19, 1930, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17647. Adulteration and misbranding of vaginal antiseptic capsules. U. S. v. 20 Boxes of Vaginal Antiseptic Capsules. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 24976. I. S. No. 2427. S. No. 3304.)

An examination of samples of a drug product known as vaginal antiseptic capsules, having shown that the article was not antiseptic, and that the labels bore claims of curative properties that it did not possess, the Secretary of Agriculture reported to the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York the herein described interstate shipment of a quantity of the product located at New York, N. Y.

On August 11, 1930, the said United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 20 boxes of vaginal antiseptic capsules, remaining in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Grape Capsule Co. (Inc.), from Allentown, Pa., on or about May 1, 1930, and had been transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that the capsules contained eucalyptol and guaiacol dissolved in castor oil. Bacteriological examination showed that the article was not antiseptic.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it was sold under the following standard of strength, "Antiseptic, * * * A Destroyer of Germs," whereas the said article fell below such professed standard, since it was not antiseptic and was not a destroyer of germs.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements on the label, "Antiseptic * * * a destroyer of germs," were false and misleading when applied to an article which was not antiseptic and was not a destroyer of germs. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements appearing on the label, regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the said article, "For Diseases and Inflammation of the Vaginal Canal," were false and fraudulent, in that the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On September 4, 1930, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

17648. Adulteration and misbranding of Vogue antiseptic powder. U. S. v. 24 Boxes of Vogue Antiseptic Powder. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 24868. I. S. No. 033876. S. No. 3203.)

An examination of samples of a drug product known as Vogue antiseptic powder from the herein described interstate shipment, having shown that the article was not antiseptic in the dilutions recommended, and that it did not conform to the National Formulary, and that the labels bore claims of curative properties that the article did not possess, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio.

On July 3, 1930, the said United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 24 boxes of Vogue antiseptic powder at Columbus, Ohio, consigned by the Muir Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., alleging that the article had been shipped from Grand Rapids, Mich., on or about May 19, 1930, and had been transported from the State of Michigan into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of potassium alum, sodium borate, zinc sulphate, salicylic acid, and small amounts of phenol, thymol, and eucalyptol. Bacteriological examination showed that the article was not antiseptic in the dilutions recommended.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the National Formulary, to wit, antiseptic powder, and differed from the official standard of strength, quality, or purity set up therein. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was sold under the following standard of strength, "Antiseptic * * * Germicide * * * two to three teaspoonfuls in a pint of water * * * one teaspoonful to a pint of water," whereas the strength of the said article fell below such professed standard in that it was not antiseptic or germicidal in the dilutions recommended.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the following statements borne on the label, "Antiseptic * * * Germicide * * * It is powerful and trustworthy * * * two or three teaspoonfuls in a pint of water * * * one teaspoon to a pint of water," were false and misleading when applied to an article which was not germicidal or antiseptic in the dilutions thus recommended for use. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the